

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,132	06/24/2003	James L. McNaughton	SU-7273	9882
2071	7590 03/13/2006		EXAMINER	
SIEBERTH & PATTY, LLC 4703 BLUEBONNET BLVD			CORBIN, ARTHUR L	
BATON ROUGE, LA 70809			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		1761	

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	\		
Office Action Commons	10/603,132	MCNAUGHTON, JAMES L.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Arthur L. Corbin	1761			
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address			
 A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	DATE OF THIS COMMUI 1.136(a). In no event, however, may od will apply and will expire SIX (6) M ute, cause the application to become	NICATION. a reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11	-10-03and 02-02,07-12,10	0-18and12-06-04.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	ance except for formal m	atters, prosecution as to the merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under	r <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-52 is/are pending in the application	on.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdo	rawn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-52</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) <u>2,6,7,11,17,23 and 49</u> is/are object					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	vor election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a	·				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	·			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	•				
· —	Laminer. Note the attack	ied Office Action of John P 10-132.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	gn priority under 35 U.S.C	. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a) All b) Some * c) None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority docume2. Certified copies of the priority docume		Application No.			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pr		• •			
application from the International Bure		on rootrod in the redonal olage			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a li	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	ot received.			
Attachment(s)	🗂				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	· -	w Summary (PTO-413) lo(s)/Mail Date			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 111003,020204,071204,	<u> </u>	of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 1761

- 1. Claims 2, 6, 7, 11, 17, 23 and 49 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 2, line 2, "an" should be added before "apparatus". In claim 6, "and" should be added after the semicolon in step b). In claim 7, line 6, "wherein" should be one word and line 7, "is" should be changed to "are". In claim 11, line 6, "of" should be changed to "on". In claim 17, line 5, "of" should be added before "said". In claim 23, line 7, "of" should be changed to "on" and in lines 8 and 9, "eviscerating" and "eviscerated" are misspelled. In claim 49, line 2, "an" should be added before "apparatus" and "carcass" made plural and line 3, "is" should be changed to "are". Appropriate correction is required.
- 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 45 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. There is no antecedent basis in claim 44 for "said washing apparatus" (claim 45, line 1). Claims 45 and 46 are indefinite since the recitation of "spray delivery system" in claims 45 and 46 is inconsistent with claim 44, which requires "immersion". Corrections are required without new matter.
- 4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Application/Control Number: 10/603,132

Art Unit: 1761

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Page 3

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 1, 2, 5/1, 5/2, 6, 7, 10/6, 10/7, 11-16, 18-20, 22/11,15,19,20, 23-28, 30-32, 34-37, 39-41, 43/36, 44, 45, 47/44,45, 48, 49 and 52/48,49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Howarth (6,908,636, cols. 2-4, 7 and 13-15 and the claims) or Howarth (6,986,910, cols. 2-5 and 10-12 and the claims). Both patents disclose treating eviscerated poultry carcasses by an inside-outside washing procedure wherein a microbiocidal solution of water and 1,3-dibromo-5,5-dialkylhydantoin, e.g. where alkyl is methyl, is sprayed onto the outside and inside of the carcasses or the outside and inside of the carcasses are immersed therein in a scald tank and in a chill tank.
- 7. Claims 17, 21, 22/17, 29, 33, 38, 42, 43/38,42, 46 and 47/46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Howarth patents. Finding the optimum concentration of the microbiocidal solution used for the outside and inside treatment of the poultry carcasses would require nothing more than routine experimentation by one reasonably skilled in this art.

Art Unit: 1761

- 8. Claims 3, 4, 5/3, 5/4, 8, 9, 10/8, 10/9, 50, 51, 52/50 and 52/51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Howarth patent in view of Hilgren et al (6,514,556, col. 17). It would have been obvious to perform the inside-outside washing in either Howarth patent by the procedure claimed by applicant wherein a spray is used to treat the outside of the carcasses and a spray probe is used to treat the inside of the carcasses since such a procedure is well known in treating eviscerated poultry carcasses with a microbiocidal solution to reduce contamination thereof, as evidenced by Hilgren et al.
- 9. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The first paragraph on page 1 of the spec. has omitted the current status of many of the applications listed therein.

Appropriate correction is required.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arthur L. Corbin whose telephone number is (571) 272-1399. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 10:30 AM to 8:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton I. Cano, can be reached on (571) 272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1761

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Arthur L Corbin
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1761

3-6-06